Part 1 – Controller Hub and Learning Switch

- Latency

```
hininet> h2 ping h5 -c 3
PING 10.0.0.42 (10.0.0.42) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=1 ttl=64 time=7.00 ms
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=2 ttl=64 time=7.68 ms
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=3 ttl=64 time=6.80 ms
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=3 ttl=64 time=6.80 ms
65 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=3 ttl=64 time=6.80 ms
66 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=3 ttl=64 time=6.80 ms
67 bytes from 10.0.0.42 ping statistics ---
68 packets transmitted, 3 received, 0% packet loss, time 2003ms
68 bytes from 10.0.0.42 ping statistics ---
69 packets transmitted, 3 received, 0% packet loss, time 2003ms
69 bytes from 10.0.0.42 ping statistics ---
```

```
mininet> h2 ping h5 -c 3
PING 10.0.0.42 (10.0.0.42) 56(84) bytes of data.
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=1 ttl=64 time=7.73 ms
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=2 ttl=64 time=0.303 ms
64 bytes from 10.0.0.42: icmp_seq=3 ttl=64 time=0.267 ms

--- 10.0.0.42 ping statistics ---
3 packets transmitted, 3 received, 0% packet loss, time 2010ms
rtt min/avg/max/mdev = 0.267/2.767/7.732/3.510 ms
```

The difference between hub controller and learning switch is that hub controller floods every time a packet is received, whereas a learning switch installs rules learned on the basis of source and destination mac address matching when it floods for the first time. Therefore, on the next ping it takes less time

Throughput

Controller Hub 33 Mb/s

Learning Switch

```
mininet> iperf h1 h5
*** Iperf: testing TCP bandwidth between h1 and h5
*** Resul<u>t</u>s: ['98.5 Gbits/sec', '98.4 Gbits/sec']
```

Rules on switches

Controller Hub

Learning Switch

```
*** s1
cookie=0x0, duration=73.743s, table=0, n_packets=3, n_bytes=238, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth2",dl_dst=fe:92:92:55:92:e2 actions=outp
cookie=0x0, duration=73.739s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=140, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth1",dl_dst=ce:85:4e:0e:9c:1f actions=outp
t:"s1-eth2
cookie=0x0, duration=73.732s, table=0, n_packets=3, n_bytes=238, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth3",dl_dst=fe:92:92:55:92:e2 actions=outp
   s1-eth1
cookie=0x0, duration=73.730s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=140, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth1",dl_dst=8a:f5:02:99:2b:0b actions=outp
t:"s1-eth3"
cookie=0x0, duration=73.724s, table=0, n_packets=9, n_bytes=714, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth4",dl_dst=fe:92:92:55:92:e2 actions=outp
it:"s1-eth1
  okie=0x0, duration=73.723s, table=0, n_packets=7, n_bytes=574, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth1",dl_dst=62:b9:81:f8:9a:af actions=outp
"s1-eth4"
cookie=0x0, duration=73.715s, table=0, n_packets=3, n_bytes=238, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth3",dl_dst=ce:85:4e:0e:9c:1f actions=outp
   s1-eth2
cookle=0x0, duration=73.714s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=140, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth2",dl_dst=8a:f5:02:99:2b:0b actions=outp
cookie=0x0, duration=73.710s, table=0, n_packets=6, n_bytes=476, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth4",dl_dst=ce:85:4e:0e:9c:1f actions=outp
cookie=0x0, duration=73.708s, table=0, n_packets=4, n_bytes=336, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth2",dl_dst=62:b9:81:f8:9a:af actions=outp
it:"s1-eth4
   kie=0x0, duration=73.686s, table=0, n_packets=6, n_bytes=476, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth4",dl_dst=8a:f5:02:99:2b:0b actions=outp
t:"s1-eth3
cookie=6xx, duration=73.682s, table=0, n_packets=4, n_bytes=336, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth3",dl_dst=62:b9:81:f8:9a:af actions=outp
t:"s1-eth4"
cookie=0x0, duration=68.522s, table=0, n packets=0, n bytes=0, priority=1,in port="s1-eth1",dl dst=ae:99:0d:29:93:42 actions=output
cookie=0x0, duration=58.537s, table=0, n_packets=0, n_bytes=0, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth2",dl_dst=ae:99:0d:29:93:42 actions=output
cookie=0x0, duration=48.555s, table=0, n_packets=0, n_bytes=0, priority=1,in_port="s1-eth3",dl_dst=ae:99:0d:29:93:42 actions=output
    ie=0x0, duration=85.348s, table=0, n_packets=75, n_bytes=7300, priority=0 actions=CONTROLLER:65535
cookie=0x0, duration=73.732s, table=0, n_packets=6, n_bytes=476, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth1",dl_dst=fe:92:92:55:92:e2 actions=outp
cookie=0x0, duration=73.732s, table=0, n_packets=3, n_bytes=238, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth2",dl_dst=fe:92:92:55:92:e2 actions=outp
it:"s2-eth3"
           duration=73.730s, table=0, n_packets=17, n_bytes=1442, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth3",dl_dst=62:b9:81:f8:9a:af actions=ou
cookie=0x0,
put:"s2-eth1"

cookie=0x0, duration=73.719s, table=0, n_packets=4, n_bytes=336, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth1",dl_dst=ce:85:4e:0e:9c:1f actions=outp
t:"s2-eth3"
cookie=6x0, duration=73.719s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=140, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth2",dl_dst=ce:85:4e:0e:9c:1f actions=outp
it:"s2-eth3"
  okie=0x0, duration=73.700s, table=0, n_packets=4, n_bytes=336, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth1",dl_dst=8a:f5:02:99:2b:0b actions=outp
   s2-eth3
cookie=0x0, duration=73.700s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=140, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth2",dl_dst=8a:f5:02:99:2b:0b actions=outp
cookie=0x0, duration=68.528s, table=0, n_packets=2, n_bytes=84, priority=1,in_port="s2-eth3",dl_dst=ae:99:0d:29:93:42 actions=outpu
            duration=85.355s, table=0, n packets=56, n bytes=5874, priority=0 actions=CONTROLLER:65535
```

To minimize the number of rules installed, we could store the mac address of s2 as destination instead of both h4, h5 on the switch s1. As right now we are going to forward to s2 only, and later s2 could forward accordingly.

If the new rules are independent from the existing ones, then assigning new ones with highest priority is sufficient.

Part 2 – Firewall and Monitor

```
*** Ping: testing p

11 -> h2 h3 X h5

12 -> h1 h3 h4 X

13 -> h1 h2 h4 X

14 -> X h2 h3 h5

15 -> h1 X X h4
```

Part 3 – Load Balancer

We could add session persistence, logging and monitoring the server health, and round robin with weighted distribution. This will result in a dynamic load balancer.